REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed on November 1, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-17 are respectfully requested.

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dougherty et al., US Patent 6,076,734 in view of Sayuda et al., US 6,069,636. The Office Action also rejected claim 8-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dougherty et al., US Patent 6,076,734 in view of Sayuda et al., US Patent 6,069,636, and further in view of Weibe et al., US Patent 6,689,966.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dougherty et al., US Patent 6,076,734 in view of Sayuda et al., US 6,069,636.

In response to the rejection to claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dougherty et al., US Patent 6,076,734 in view of Sayuda et al., US 6,069,636, Applicants hereby traverse the rejection and submit that claim 1-7 are in allowable form.

With respect to claim 1, as originally filed, recites: "A pixel array for a non-touch panel input device, wherein the pixel array at least comprises a plurality of first pixel structures with

each pixel structure at least comprising: a sub-pixel; and a first shadow pixel positioned on one side of the sub-pixel."

Applicants submit that such a pixel array as set forth in claim 1 is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Dougherty '734, Sayuda '636, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

The Examiner admitted that Dougherty '734 does not expressly disclose "the pixel array at least comprises a plurality of first pixel structures with each pixel structure at least comprising: a sub-pixel; and a first shadow pixel positioned on one side of the sub-pixel."

The Examiner alleged that "FIG. 9 of Sayuda '636 contains subpixels in the first and third line with 'shadow pixels', in line two, on one side of the subpixels". Applicants respectfully disagree with the viewpoints hold by the Examiner on the subject matter. As shown in FIG. 9 (Column 7, lines 10-17), Sayuda '636 teaches "the pixel 45 is produced in a rightmost position in a cell 46 of the dot screen when the additional information is 1, and the pixel 45 is produced at the center of the cell 46 when the additional information data is 0. Thus the additional information can be added in the images by changing the position of the pixel 45 in the cell 46 by the additional information data without changing the density of the image and without being recognized." The pixel 45 and the cell 46 are not numbered in FIG. 9, and the corresponding numbered items can be found in FIG. 18. The Examiner failed to point out which items are indicated respectively to the pixel, the sub-pixel and the first shadow pixel as set forth in claim 1. Applicants acknowledged that Sayuda '636 discloses a cell array at least comprising a plurality of

FAX NO.

Customer No.: 31561 Application No.: 10/604,689

Docket No.:10870-US-PA

cell structures 46 with each cell structure 46 at least comprising a pixel 45. Sayuda '636 failed to teach, disclose or suggest the sub-pixel and the first shadow pixel that are required by the present pixel array as set forth in claim 1.

Further, the present pixel array employs the shadow pixel 204 for determining its actual emission location relative to the panel (Paragraph 0031, FIG. 2). On the contrary, Sayuda '636 adds additional information by changing the position of the pixels 45 in the cell 46. Therefore, Sayuda '636 actually teaches away from employing such a shadow pixel 204.

Therefore, since neither Dougherty '734 nor Sayuda '636 discloses "the pixel array at least comprises a plurality of first pixel structures with each pixel structure at least comprising: a sub-pixel; and a first shadow pixel positioned on one side of the sub-pixel", Applicants submit that the reference combination between Dougherty '734 and Sayuda '636 could not be deemed to render claim 1, as originally filed, obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of independent claim 1 as originally filed over Dougherty '734 in view of Sayuda '636 are respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2-7 incorporates all the subject matter of independent claim 1 and adds respective additional subject matter. As detailed above, it is asserted that claim 1 is allowable. Thus it is submitted that the dependent claims 2-7 are also allowable, and Applicant requests that the rejection relating thereto be withdrawn.

Page 4

The Office Action rejected claim 8-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dougherty et al., US Patent 6,076,734 in view of Sayuda et al., US Patent 6,069,636, and further in view of Weibe et al., US Patent 6,689,966.

Dependent claims 8-17 incorporates all the subject matter of independent claim 1 and adds respective additional subject matter. As detailed above, it is asserted that claim 1 is allowable. Thus it is submitted that the dependent claims 8-17 are also allowable, and Applicant requests that the rejection relating thereto be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-17 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date:

Jan. 25, 2006

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Respectfully submitted,

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office 7th Floor-1, No. 100 Roosevelt Road, Section 2 Taipei, 100 Taiwan

Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800 Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233

Fax: 011-886-2-2309-7233
Email:belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
usa@jcipgroup.com.tw